

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated March 23, 2005. Claims 1-10 remain pending in this application. Claim 1 IS the independent claim. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

In response to the objection to the specification for failing to include headings, Applicants gratefully acknowledge the Office Action's suggestion; however respectfully decline to add the headings, as they are not required in accordance with MPEP §608.01(a).

On the merits, the Office Action rejected Claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zhou (U.S. Patent No. 6,466,170; hereinafter "Zhou") in view of Okabe et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,462,714; hereinafter "Okabe"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection and requests its withdrawal for at least the following reasons.

As stated in the Office Action, Zhou fails to recite or suggest a second metallization structure wherein the second metallization has at least a resonant printed conductor structure. The Office Action argues that Okabe supplies the elements of Applicant's Claim 1 which Zhou fails to recite or suggest. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Okabe recites a side surface slot antenna (see, e.g., Col. 3, lines 40-50) which

N:\UserPublic\WX\Amendments\2005 Amendments\DE020057.amd.doc 2

is formed by a conductor on a top, lower, and side surface of a conductive cubic (see, e.g., Col. 6, lines 30-43). This single band antenna is tuned to a frequency band based on the dimensions of slot 2 i.e., the portion of the cubic which is not covered by a conductor (see e.g., Col. 6, lines 44-58). Okabe's conductor does not recite or suggest a second metallization structure that has a resonant printed conductor structure. Thus the combination of Zhou in view of Okabe fails to recite or suggest every element of Applicant's Claim 1.

Additionally, Applicant traverses the § 103(a) rejection over Zhou and Okabe because the references cannot be properly combined because one skilled in the art at the time of the invention would lack the motivation to combine them. Simply packaging Zhou's multiband slot antenna atop Okabe's side slot single band antenna would not have been obvious because tuning Okabe's antenna requires varying the area of slot 2 which includes portions of the side and top of a conductive cubic. This would inadvertently affect the tuning of Zhou's multiband slot antenna and would not be considered an effective way to provide an easily tunable multiband antenna where resonant frequencies in the individual operating frequency bands could be tuned largely independently of one another. Thus Applicant traverses the § 103(a) rejection of Claim 1 for at least this additional reason.

N:\UserPublic\WX\Amendments\2005 Amendments\DE020057.amd.doc

3


Also, Applicant respectfully traverses the § 103(a) rejection at least because it is based upon impermissible hindsight. Improper hindsight consists of "use[ing] the claimed invention itself as a blueprint for piecing together elements in the prior art to defeat the patentability of the claimed invention," see *In Re Denis Rouffet*, 47 USPQ.2d 1453, 1457-58 (Fed. Cir. 1998). Applicant believes the rejection of Claim 1 over Zhou in view of Okabe to be impermissible hindsight at least because the Office Action looks to the elements of Claim 1 as a blueprint for piecing the prior art together, since the § 103 rejection fails to meet a prima facie obviousness test.

Claims 2-10 depend from independent Claim 1 discussed above and are believed patentable for at least the same reasons. In addition, Applicant respectfully believes Claims 2-10 to be independently patentable and request separate consideration of each claim. In addition, Applicant additionally traverses the § 103(a) rejections of Claims 7 and 8 because Zhou fails to recite or suggest a second metallization structure and therefore it cannot be relied upon to recite or suggest a feed pin or shorting pin, respectively, which contacts both a first and a second metallization structure. Applicant requests withdrawal of the § 103(a) rejections of Claims 7 and 8 for at least these additional reasons.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached by telephone at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Aaron Waxler,  
Reg. 48,027  
(914) 333-9608  
August 23, 2005